



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 48

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

26 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor -  
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is absent, and the Premier, I will have to put my question to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett).

The first phase of the mill modernization programme at Corner Brook is complete. Has the Kruger Board of Directors approved the \$80 million second phase of that modernization programme?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the status is within the hierarchy of Kruger -

MR. FLIGHT:  
You do not know!

MR. BARRETT:  
- but I do know that government's position is that we have reviewed the extension to the mill modernization programme. Our information is that the project is ahead of schedule and that they will be continuing, as soon as

engineering has been completed for the continuation of that modernization programme.

MR. FLIGHT:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor -  
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister should know that, as a result of the completion of the first phase, people are being laid off, unions are concerned, and the people of the West Coast are worried.

I would ask, since the minister is familiar with what happened in the first phase and is familiar with Kruger's plans, why it is that the Kruger Board of Directors has not announced the commencement of the second phase of that mill modernization programme.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, the full information and details surrounding the extended modernization programme, which is beyond that which was first initiated, was part of the initial agreement on Kruger taking over what was going to be a shutdown mill. Are the expectations of some of the workers in the mill such that they do not understand and cannot appreciate the fact that there has been more done, it has been done on budget, it has been quicker done than the expectation, to the point that it is not possible to proceed with additional work until certain fundamental things have to be done, such things as engineering? Now, maybe the

member does not understand what engineering to do a project or an extension to a project is all about. But it is a very fundamental issue that must be addressed and must be taken care of. I am sure that those people working in the mill, who have given any kind of thought to this, are fully recognizing and cognizant of the fact that this is a necessary procedure. It has to be followed in order for the modernization programme to take place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister will know that as a result of the way the first modernization programme went that three year's work was completed in two years, and there are problems with the modernization as a result of engineering construction being pushed at the same time. But that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The minister alluded to it, but maybe that is not the issue.

Kruger is associated with the construction of a pulp and chemical plant in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in Labrador. I ask the minister: Is government insisting that Kruger undertake the construction of a pulp and chemical plant in conjunction with the modernization programme or before the Corner Brook mill modernization is complete? Is that the reason for government's insistence that either the pulp and chemical plant in Labrador be

undertaken in conjunction with the \$80 million modernization plan, or that the pulp and chemical plant be built before the modernization is complete? Is that the reason the Board of Directors of Kruger is not approving the second phase of the modernization programme?

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:  
Mr. Speaker, it is almost humorous. The difficulties that have been created in Corner Brook, the difficulties according to the member opposite: (1) there is more productivity in that mill than there has ever been before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:  
(2) The quality of the newsprint is better than it has ever been there before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:  
(3) There are stronger and more diversified international markets to purchase that newsprint than there has ever been before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:  
(4) There has been more done to rehabilitate machines, that were supposed to have never been brought into service before, and that is part of the component that is now being addressed and that new engineering studies are being

done to address.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

(5) I do not know of what kind a person's intelligence would have to be to try to take in isolation what Kruger are doing, legitimately, fulfilling all of their obligations, contractually and otherwise to do with Corner Brook, and try to in some way tie that to the government 'forcing' them, requiring them to do something else in Goose Bay. That is totally irrational. It is something that this government would have no party to. We would like to see Kruger or anybody else do whatever they want to do in Goose Bay, but to try to put that on the backs of the people of Corner Brook and to hold up a legitimate exercise in modernization of that plant, is totally irrational and certainly would not be tolerated by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the minister tell the House, then, why it is, since the bulk of the money for the modernization programme in the mill in Corner Brook is coming from the federal and provincial governments, since they are bearing the bulk of the expense, why is the government allowing the situation to exist in Corner Brook that is causing worry and concern? The unions are made

up, Mr. Minister, of people who work in the mill, and they are concerned. Why is the minister not coming clean and telling us what the problem is with Kruger's Board of Directors announcing the start-up of the second phase of the modernization programme? Why are you permitting this uneasiness to build up on the West Coast?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite have a fixation about coming clean. I think there must be something in their own closets which requires this kind of an attitude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the total inconsistency and the total erroneousness of the remarks of the hon. member opposite are obvious. I, as Minister of Development, have not received one call, not one expression of concern, not one, from anybody in Corner Brook to do with this situation because I think that all rational persons out there who think about the project, as I have indicated, are fully aware of the reasons that we cannot plough on with further expansion without engineering being done. The fact is the productivity of the work force - for which they should be commended, they should be given credit - engaged in the modernization programme was such that they exceeded the expectations of the company and of

government and performed the work ahead of schedule, which caused a delay in the completion of the engineering work which was going on anyway to coincide with the regular scheduled completion of the first phase.

MR. FLIGHT:

What did the Premier say to the unions last week, or vice versa?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. BAIRD:

When you get important enough you will be there.

MR. FLIGHT:

You knew what he said to them.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Premier but I understand that he is not here, so I guess I will have to ask the question of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). It concerns the hydroponics projects, in particular the Premier's attempt this morning again to stifle criticism, which is the legitimate right of every taxpayer, to ask questions and I guess the right of the press and indeed the right of the Opposition. The questions I had for the Premier I will ask of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I will ask him a couple of questions that came from the Premier's press release this morning that refers directly to his own department, when he tried to get the media in this Province to go somewhere else to get the answers when supposedly the government themselves have them.

I want to ask him question number three, contained in the Premier's press release this morning, as it relates to his department: 'Where is the research' - Mr. Minister, these are the Premier's words - 'that your department has done on the Sprung technology?' And: 'What experts in the field did the department' - your department - 'consult on this issue? And where is their report?'

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, there were several people in my department working on this, from the Deputy Minister down, Mr. Speaker, mostly agricultural people working on it. As I explained before, they did some research on this, they had some concerns. The government, before they signed the heads of agreement, addressed these concerns and, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to a very successful project in the greenhouse operation in the Brookfield Road area in this Province.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I think it is worthy of note that the minister, whose Premier this morning berated the media, and indeed the people of this Province for not going to get information, did not answer the two questions himself. Let me ask him another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:  
Do not be bawling out!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
The Premier this morning gave as his reasons for stonewalling, being secret about this, got upset and threw in Come By Chance again, which is another secret deal, he says they were legitimate, the Premier says -

MR. BAIRD:  
There is no doubt about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, if I could put my question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
He says the reasons are legitimate because there were legal documents to be signed. Now I would like to ask the minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), Mr. Speaker, and the gofer from Placentia, can you keep them quiet so my hon. colleague can ask his question?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister what it is that could be so legally important, as the Premier keeps saying in this Legislature, for the Premier not to release information which will tell the farmers and the local producers in this Province what effect, if any, the development of the Sprung project in Mount Pearl is going to have on their ability to produce their product and indeed to sell it? Now can the minister stand up and legitimately tell us what is so legal that the Premier himself cannot release this piece of information which he says his department has? Why has he done those things and why will he not release them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Before the hon. minister replies, I am having a considerably amount of trouble with two hon. members on my left, it is not the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), and I would ask them for their co-operation.

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, the type of produce that Sprung will be producing as of November of this year is produced for maybe two months of the year in this Province. There might be .5 per cent of the local market satisfied by that production, Mr. Speaker, and this project has been signed with the

intention of exporting 80 per cent of this produce to the Atlantic area, Mr. Speaker.

If the hon. members would do a little bit of homework - not very much, I do not expect them to do too much homework - just one call to Statistics Canada to ask them how many cucumbers and how many tomatoes did New Brunswick import last year, because, Mr. Speaker, it does not seem like it is any good for me to tell them, so let them go look for it themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that he is asking the people of Newfoundland, this legislature, the media and everybody else to take a \$13 million leap of faith. Now, let me ask him, Mr. Speaker, what is the objection to releasing the type of information that he just talked about, the export markets, for example? Does he not believe that the people in this Province have enough intelligence, and even his own members and the member from Terra Nova have enough intelligence to see if something is good for this Province or not? How can the Premier and the minister on the one hand deny the information on the technical evaluation, marketing surveys, financial commitments and the effect on the local farmers, and at the same time, this morning, throw a tantrum that the media of this Province are not reporting the correct information? How in

the name of God can that occur when the government itself is stonewalling and keeping this information from this legislature and from the people in this Province? How can that go on?

MR. FLIGHT:

A good question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

It is ironic that these questions still come up, Mr. Speaker. We explained all the information that was available on this Sprung proposal that could be released when we made the announcement. All the information that the hon. gentleman is looking for, and that the media should be looking for, is public knowledge right now, today, Mr. Speaker, if they contact Ag Canada or Stats Canada, they can get that information immediately. A market study costs money, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the information that we have is not being released just yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Whose money, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman think he is spending? Does he think it is his own? Does he not believe that the people of this Province have the right to know what they pay for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no point of order there. The hon. member does not like the answer he was given so he jumps to his feet on a point of order. That is if anything, a supplementary question and, if he did not have a supplementary question, let him let one of his colleagues ask a question. But it certainly is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, if a business is setting up anywhere, I do not care if it is a Sprung business or anyone, they will do market studies out of their own money. That is what they do market studies for. They do feasibility studies and they do market studies. Mr. Speaker, it is Sprung money that has been spent on some market studies in this Province for this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Do you have the study?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any business that starts up with good

produce, and wants to sell their produce, that is going to come out before they are started and tell everyone where their markets are because they would lose their markets immediately, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:  
My question is for the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). I would like to give the minister an opportunity to respond to some very serious statements that were made by Dr. Hubert Kitchen, the head of Memorial's Department of Educational Administration, last evening in which he said, and I quote, "The educational system presently operating in Newfoundland's rural communities contributes substantially to their decline."

Would the minister like to respond to this very serious allegation?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly a pleasure to get a question from the hon. member. I think it is the first one he has had the opportunity to ask me, and an important one.

I was at the affair yesterday, I had to leave a bit early, and I did not get to hear all of Dr. Kitchen's address. I must say from what I read about it and from what I heard it was extremely interesting and extremely timely. Because what it does and what he



is saying is basically what we have been saying ourselves, that the educational system in rural Newfoundland has to be changed considerably. We have been doing that, and I can go on for an hour now and outline initiatives taken this past couple of years to show the hon. member what has been done in rural Newfoundland.

In the Throne Speech this year, Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned the curriculum in our schools and where it is not really conducive to producing the type of all-round education needed, especially in rural Newfoundland where we might be after getting away from our roots as such, and we should have more local content. We are in that process right now of adding to the fair amount that has been brought into the curriculum in the last couple of years. So I have no argument at all with what Dr. Kitchen is saying. I think he has some excellent points and he is right in line with what we have been saying ourselves.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the remarks that were made representing only the tip of the iceberg of other concerns that have been brought forward on a number of questions concerning the whole educational system, the minister has told this House in past months that there is a comprehensive review underway in his department dealing with student - teacher ratio, the Small Schools Report and the denominational question, and I

would like to ask the minister if he could, at this time, give us some indication as to the status of this comprehensive review within his own department?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member has been, because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

- the Small Schools Report was tabled in the House, has been made public, and discussed by everyone. Certainly the hon. gentlemen opposite have all received copies. The comprehensive review of problems such as allocation of teachers, here in St. John's there was a big issue earlier in the year. The headline in the paper stated, People Concerned Because Of An \$8 Million Cutback In Education. Shortly after that we showed that it was not a \$8 million cut back this year, it was a \$40 million increase in the Education budget. Part of this increase was to provide for fifty extra teaching positions to offset some of those that were being lost. With that we completely changed the ratio - not the ratio, but the allocation formula of teachers. All the boards have been notified, they have been given their new allocations. It is a topic that is being discussed with the Superintendents now. And 95 per cent of those who are involved have responded very positively. Some of them have concerns as to how it will affect them, and, of

course, the formulas vary. But a whole new allocation formula has been set in place.

The French study has been brought in and made public, and I can go on and on. What he is asking about has already been made public.

MR. LONG:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would be to ask the minister, in light of unanswered concerns - and I appreciate the minister's comments on the teacher allocation, that he has come forward to the House and made that information public because I have had representation on that - are there other initiatives that we can expect as the school year comes to a close, to deal in particular with the financial problems that many boards are facing, and in particular with the capital freeze that this government has announced, the serious financial difficulties that the educational system is facing, as we go into the September new school year?

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. gentlemen over there will not give me time to answer that question because it could take about two hours. But just very briefly, to put it in perspective, there is no freeze as it relates to the Department of Education.

We have committed \$20 million for the next three years for capital construction. We brought in last year a tax equalization grant to help boards, all of which have responded very, very positively to their members, and to government members, etc. We have added \$500,000 to that this year. We have changed the allocation formula to put extra teachers into the system. We have brought in a five year plan for allocations which has been universally accepted. And I can go on and on, Mr. Speaker, naming initiatives that have been accepted by the Opposition from letters that they have sent to us, by these Superintendents out there, by the parents, by the school boards, and by everybody except the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) in relation to the minimum price for milk. I would like to ask the minister what action has he taken as Minister of Consumer Affairs to defend the interest of the consumer on this issue? In particular, what protection is afforded the consumer against arbitrary price increases by the milk processors, and subsequent increases by the retailers? I would like to ask the minister what is he doing to protect consumers against this minimum price on milk, particularly in light of the processors recent increase of six cents on two litres, which was

done arbitrarily by them? Is he aware of that increase? And what has he done to protect the consumers with respect to that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the increase that has been passed on to consumers by some of the outlets in the Province and in my opinion the increase is unwarranted. I think that for the right reasons the Milk Marketing Board made a decision to put a minimum price on a two litre carton of milk. I have some discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, and we are hoping that the issue will be resolved shortly.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I am glad to hear that the minister is aware that there has been a six cent per two litre carton of milk imposed by the processors. Because he is aware, why has the minister not seen fit to use the mechanism under The Newfoundland Products Marketing Act of 1973, since there is a mechanism there to make the processors appear to defend this increase? Will he do that under that particular piece of legislation, bring the processors to justify this increase under this particular act? Will he do that for the consumer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion by the hon. member is well taken and I will consider that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and it is related to the review committee that he just recently announced consisting of three deputy ministers and the Secretary of Treasury Board. My question to the minister is: Is the minister not aware that the purpose announced by government in setting up this review committee, namely to review the effectiveness and efficiency of government operations and programmes, is normally, and indeed routinely, a function of the Auditor General in every other province of Canada? So would the minister not agree that the Auditor General's office, given the proper legislative authority, is the proper and most effective and most efficient process for a review of this kind?

MR. CALLAN:

Hear, hear! Now answer that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is really confusing the role of the Auditor General with

the role of government itself. Government itself is undertaking this review. Now it is using the mechanism of some of its senior staff to do it, but the government itself is in control of this review process, it will be receiving interim reports and will be giving directions as the review process goes on. This is a government review, it is not done by three independent individuals, and certainly the government of this Province is not run by the Auditor General. The Auditor General has his proper function in assessing things after the fact. This is forward planning we are engaged in here, and it is a government operation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that one of the functions of the Auditor General in every other province of Canada is to review the effectiveness and efficiency of government operations and government programmes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister, is it the intention of government in setting up this review committee to put up a smoke screen or to use diversionary tactics to detract from the Auditor General's request for an Auditor General's Act which would empower the Auditor General to conduct, on an ongoing, orderly, and systematic basis, the kind of systematic audit that this Province should get? Is this the intention of the government, to deny the request of the Auditor General to bring in an Auditor General's Act so that the Auditor General can carry on the kind of

ongoing, comprehensive audit that this Province requires and not this flimflam that he has initiated with this committee?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we recently had a visitation from the representatives of Standard and Poor, a world renowned credit rating agency in New York. It is one of the two most renowned credit rating agencies that everyone recognizes, the other being Moody's. These representatives from Standard and Poor were most interested in discussing in detail with us our budget, our plans for the future, and, in particular, how we intend to manage the financial affairs of the Province in the years ahead to achieve a better situation than we have now, and everyone recognizes we need that.

One of the things Standard and Poor representatives were most impressed by, asked most questions about, and were most laudatory to us about, was the setting up of this review process under the control of government, using senior personnel, senior, experienced deputy minister personnel. They felt that this was an extremely positive action to take. They certainly did not bring up the point that this should be undertaken by the Auditor General. Of course, we never did expect him to do so, because it is certainly not a job that the Auditor General should be doing. He has his functions to perform but government has its functions to perform, and what is being set up under this review process is clearly a government function and we are using the best

personnel we have at our disposal.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

I would ask the Minister of Finance: Why, then, in lieu of not giving the Auditor General the proper legislative authority to carry on a comprehensive audit, if such a committee was necessary, was it not composed of independent, outside commissioners to ensure its findings and recommendations were not affected by self-interest or partisan considerations? Is this going to be another boondoggle like the Municipal Capital Projects Board which defeated the very purpose for which it was set up?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member really does not understand the process. What was set up is not the finalized process, it is the first essential step. If the hon. member will remember, in the Budget Speech I mentioned, on behalf of government, that we would be considering the appointment or the contracting of outside experts, business consultants, that type of thing, if and as necessary. So this is the first essential step, probably the major step, I grant, in setting up this review committee of senior, long experienced deputy ministers, but it does not in any way preclude at a later stage that others will be brought into the review process. As a matter of fact, I think in the announcement

of the review process it was stated that there would also be a research arm as part of this review process. I can assure the member that this is a very, very serious, indepth look, in the shortterm and in the longer term, a review of the programmes government has and the outlook in giving public services to people of this Province and the cost of so doing.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

There is just time for one question.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). While it concerns a federal government regulation, I want to ask the minister if he has ever made any representation to his federal counterpart to have the regulation within the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, that now requires that Newfoundland fishermen who catch salmon, for example, as a by-catch in cod traps and other types of unlicensed, unspecified gear, if he has ever made representation to the federal government to have that law rescinded? It is a bad law, one that is unenforceable and is causing Newfoundland fishermen to either dump good food or encourage them to become poachers and to break that federal regulation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I thank the hon. gentleman for the question. The answer is yes. As

a matter of fact, I tabled a Ministerial Statement in the House about a month or six weeks ago outlining various initiatives that the provincial government was taking in conjunction with the Fishermen's Union. We went to Ottawa, met with the federal minister, asked for certain changes in the present management plan, and asked for certain other changes in the 1988 management plan, one of which addresses the very situation that the hon. gentlemen referred to.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, it arises out of one of the responses by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I realize, if one may judge from the press reports of the Premier's so-called news conference this morning, that the Premier has become unstrung by Sprung. But I hope the minister has not become unstrung by Sprung. Mr. Speaker, today in one of his answers - and he should keep in mind that the whole thesis for not releasing information on his part and the Premier's part -

MR. TOBIN:  
That is not a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:  
This is a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, it is not.

MR. MITCHELL:  
What is your point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Just wait, my dear. Sit back.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, they are all unstrung by Sprung.

MR. PEACH:  
You will soon be unstrung by Clyde.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He should be strung up by Clyde.

MR. SIMMONS:  
What would you know about stability?

Mr. Speaker, they are all unstrung. It is very sad. The point of order, Mr. Speaker - the minister must be aware that the whole premise, the whole basis on which he and the Premier have refused to release information is that the deal, in their words, is not yet signed. Now, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the minister in responding to one of the questions from my friend for Fogo indicated -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not making a point of order. Maybe he has something, so I ask him to come to the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Well, that is a beautiful editorial, Mr. Speaker, but I am making a point of order and I am

trying to make it heard.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has not made a point of order as of now and I would ask the hon. member to please make the point of order.

MR. BARRY:  
He has not had a chance to make it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I agree, Sir. I agree. I will try again, Mr. Speaker.

The minister in response to one of the questions today from my friend and colleague for Fogo indicated, and these are his words, 'We signed the deal.' Now, Mr. Speaker, was that just a slip of the tongue? Has the deal been signed? I submit he has been misleading the House all this time and has now given information which is inconsistent with that which the Premier has given in earlier days. He has now indicated that the deal has been signed and, if that is the case, he has misled the House. If it is not the case, he should now get up and say he gave false information during the Question Period.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
That is certainly not a point of order and this is not Question Period, Mr. Speaker. But the final legal documents have not been signed. I said today that the heads of agreement were signed

and announced, a statement was made. Heads of agreement, agreement in principle, you might not understand it, but that is actually what was signed. The legal agreement is not yet signed and there is no finalization of the deal to date.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order there is no point of order.

MR. TULK:  
A new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A new point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, as my friend for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said, everybody over there seems to be unstrung or high-sprung. And I can understand why the minister would be. The minister cannot slither around this thing, Mr. Speaker. He has to stand in this House and give correct information.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Just what is it he has signed?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! There is no point of order.

### Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here from 378 people from Grey River, in Burgeo, and it is concerning the operation of the Ramea, Burgeo, Grey River ferry. It has the usual greetings to the hon. House of Assembly and legislature assembled, and 'The petition of the undersigned residents of Grey River in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir humbly sheweth.'

The prayer of the petition: "That since the motor vessel Gallipoli provides a very essential service for the people of Grey River in that not only passengers avail of the services but it is also required for the delivery of freight for the local stores.

"That the fishermen of Grey River are completely dependent on the ferry for the delivery of their bait.

"We feel that it is not fair to these people who work so hard for a living and thereby contribute to the economy of the Province to have to take time they could very well use fishing to have to travel to Ramea to obtain their bait at considerable expense.

"That the community is dependent on the ferry for medical services as the doctor at Ramea uses the ferry for his weekly visits. We feel any cutback in service by the ferry would be detrimental to the health care provided for this community.

"That people who have to travel over the Burgeo Road for business or medical reasons should not have to spend days away from home for this purpose but should have at least two days per week to avail of the ferry service to connect with transportation at Burgeo.

"That although the parties involved have agreed to have the ferry operate on a schedule permitting trips to Grey River on Tuesday and Thursday until September 15, 1987, we can see no reason why that service will not be as much required after that date as it is now.

"We, therefore, humbly request that when a new schedule is drawn up for the motor vessel Gallipoli that the present frequency of calling at Grey River on Tuesday and Thursday will be maintained.

"And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

Mr. Speaker, there was a petition presented earlier this year on this ferry. At that time, the Department of Transportation was going to arbitrarily cancel the ferry on May 1. Because of the petition and because of the uproar that was caused, that plan was withdrawn and the minister said the ferry would remain there until September 15. Now, the people of that area, as you can see from the 378 people in Grey River and Burgeo who have put their names on the petition, do not agree with any cutback in the ferry service. I am sure we are all aware that it is a service that is a necessity and it is one that the people of the South Coast must have. It is their Trans-Canada Highway. That ferry system to those three communities on the South coast is their link to the rest of Newfoundland.

Just to give you an example of the hardship that people have to go through to travel on this: There are three children from Grey River attending the School for the Deaf here in St. John's. I do not



wonder that the Minister of Education looks down when I say that. Last week, when the school had to close because they were moving to their new quarters, those children had to be sent home. I tried to get a helicopter to take them home, but the Department of Education and the Department of Transportation turned it down.

Here is how some of those children, aged seven to eighteen, had to get home to Grey River: St. John's to Corner Brook by CN bus; local bus from Corner Brook to Burgeo; ferry to Ramea; overnight in Ramea; then the next day to Grey River, and they had to repeat that to come back. Children from seven to eighteen years of age who are attending the School for the Deaf had to be put through this hardship to go home. Now, it was bad enough that they had to do this, but then they had to miss two days of school the next week coming back. I use this as an example because I did contact both the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Education concerning this. I think it is a shame that in the 20th Century children have to be subjected to this, especially deaf children.

MR. W. CARTER:

It would be easier to get to Japan.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, it would be easier to get to Japan. Some of the ministers over there on their junkets around the world could get there a lot faster than we can get children to Grey River.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about your trip to Florida?

MR. GILBERT:

Unlike you, Sir, I paid for my trip to Florida. If you go somewhere, you go with the idea it is government business and then sneak off on a holiday. Anytime I go anywhere, I pay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Do not worry!

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only is it a fact that children have to suffer -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, may I have silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would remind the hon. member his time has now elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation as has been pointed out in the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, in reading the prayer of the petition I pointed out the hardship that ordinary people have

to suffer and then I told of children who have to suffer to get to Grey River. Now we have a government that is going to cut back the service to Grey River even further, they are talking about the fact that they are going to cut this service down from two days a week to one day a week, starting in September. For the people who live in Grey River 365 days of the year, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be just as much need for that ferry in September as there is right now, and it is for that reason those 378 people have presented this petition to this House. They want the Department of Transportation to act on it and instead of downgrading the ferry service into Grey River come September 15, to increase it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. FLIGHT:

Is the minister going to respond?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if there is someone on the other side who wants to speak, of course I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition that has been so ably presented and with such concern for his constituents by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. As he speaks of this ferry system, I have to say to him that I feel a somewhat kindred spirit, in that the people of Fogo Island, under this Department of Transportation, has not enjoyed the kind of ferry service that they should enjoy if

government were sensitive to the needs of places like Ramea, Burgeo, Grey River, Fogo Island, St. Brendan's and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that the government has gone and built a new ferry for the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir's district, a nice boat, but what we see the government doing in most cases around the Province - if you look at the Premier's district, they have a few more trips than the rest of us. I suppose that has something to do with the fact that he believes that whatever he says has to go - is building nice boats yet the number of trips remain practically the same, the service is hardly improved at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir says, the ferry to Ramea and the ferry to Grey River and the ferry to all of those islands and isolated communities is the highway and, as such, should be treated as a highway. Those people should have the same right as other citizens of this Province, and that I have or that the member for Placentia has, where he can get in his car and drive anywhere he wishes to go.

Mr. Speaker, you have to live in a place like Ramea, in a place like Fogo Island, in a place like Grey River to know just how much they depend on that boat, to know just how much they depend on the service, and to know the kind of hardships and the kind of hindrances and blockades are placed in the way of those people, even if they want to develop economically. I am sure the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir can relate such instances to us, as well, when it comes to Ramea.

The Co-operative on Fogo Island

lost \$25,000 in one three week period this year because of the method of taking off one boat and putting on another one. They lost \$25,000 on their product from Fogo Island Co-op, and that is not a small amount of money.

The member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir speaks of handicapped children, deaf children, having to spend a number of days on the road, and I suspect at great cost to their families, just because they live in a place that is isolated, and just because this government believes in financing their own trips around the world and to be able to increase the Minister of Development's budget - I think it was practically tenfold in the Department of Development - for travel, for transportation and communications. Unbelievable! What did they do? Did they cut their own departments? Absolutely not. They cut the ferry service to Ramea and to Grey River, they cut the ferry service to Fogo Island, they increased the fares. I suppose, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, the fares are increased down there, as well? They increased the fares. They cut back on the number of ships. Now, it is all bad enough for those people to have to put up with that, but in the process they are stifling economic growth in the Province. I suppose Ramea is one of the most productive areas in this Province.

MR. GILBERT:

Four hundred full-time jobs.

MR. TULK:

How many?

MR. GILBERT:

Four hundred full-time jobs.

MR. TULK:

Four hundred full-time jobs and here we have a government that, after September 15, is going to cut the one thing that is very vital to economic development -

MR. SIMMONS:

Shameful!

MR. TULK:

- transportation. While the Minister of Development and practically every minister over there have all kinds of increases for travelling all over the world - I suppose up to Alberta to look at the cucumbers - while they do that, while they carry on that kind of nonsense, they cut the transportation system to one of the most productive areas in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

It makes sense, does it not?

MR. TULK:

Now, where is the sense?

MR. FLIGHT:

Where is the logic?

MR. TULK:

Where is the logic? Can they afford it?

MR. FLIGHT:

Can the government afford not to?

MR. TULK:

I would not expect them to know. I would not expect the Minister of Finance, the man who has created the greatest degree of public debt in this Province, to know anything about it. I would not expect him to know, because he has never, I suspect -

DR. COLLINS:

Who funds the (inaudible)?

MR. TULK:

- got on a boat in his life. He would not know what to do with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is, the Minister of Finance has a conscience and what we are now saying bothers him because he knows it makes sense. But I would urge the minister, as one of the senior ministers in government, to turn around the Premier's head, to get him off the cuckoo deals that he is on and develop this Province in the way that it should be developed; develop the Rameas, develop the Grey Rivers, develop the Fogo Islands, and then you will not have the need to travel to Alberta for Sprung, or to the Far East for cotton mills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker, I stand, certainly, to support the petition presented by the hon. member. However, I wish, when he made his statement, that he had told the truth about the students who were transported back and forth during the May 24 th. weekend. Before I get into that, I would like to say in supporting the petition that I can fully support or fully appreciate the problems faced by people who live in remote areas. I have had the opportunity during the year to visit several remote areas in the Province.

MR. TULK:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the

member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Did I hear the hon. gentleman just say that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir did not tell the truth?

Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot say in this House indirectly what you cannot say directly, and to say the hon. member did not tell the truth is the same as saying that he lied. The hon. gentleman should withdraw it. The fact of the matter is, he has told the truth.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
To the point of order, I think what I said was that I wished the member had told the whole truth about it. If I did not say that, if I said the truth to indicate that the member was telling a lie to the House I would certainly withdraw it, because I certainly do not think that he was lying to the House. However, he did not tell the whole story and I would like to mention it in my remarks. I do withdraw any implication.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. member has withdrawn the comment he made.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
As I have said, I can appreciate the life that people live in remote areas. They do suffer a lot of disadvantages, and certainly where things can be done

to assist them in any way, it is our right and our duty to do it. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Transportation is not here to respond to the petition, because I am sure he could state quite clearly the number of initiatives that have been taken to improve the lot of people who live in rural areas in the Province, including the new ferries and trying to arrange schedules and so on that would be more productive. If you find that new problems arise, then new initiatives have to be taken and I am sure they will be addressed in time.

In relation to the remarks made by the hon. member about the transportation of students from the School for the Deaf, I would like to make it clear for the House and for the record that my department makes provision each year to transport students who attend the School for the Deaf, from all areas of the Province, to and from their homes. Students from more remote areas, who only go occasionally, are transported quite often by helicopter. There are designated holidays on which they are transported back and forth. The 24th weekend - I think it was on the 18th or 19th - this was not or never has been one of the designated holidays. It was decided by the parents, I presume, that the children were going to go home and arrangements were made to get them home through the regular process. But it was not one of the designated holidays whereby we had budgeted for their transportation, and everyone involved was well aware of that. So, to say that we would not transport them by chopper and that they had to go through this inconvenience, was not our choice at all, because usually they stay

in town and visit friends and so on during weekends like this, it was a decision made by themselves to go home for that weekend and consequently they made the arrangements.

MR. GILBERT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. - the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

The story that is being told there is a little different than the actual story, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to point out to the minister what exactly happened. The School for the Deaf was closing -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I am pointing out to the minister that he is misrepresenting what really happened. I would like to outline to him the story of what did happen.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

He said they were going home for a weekend. It was not a weekend, Mr. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member may not like what the hon. minister is saying, but there is no point of order.

MR. GILBERT:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

I have heard the minister stand there, Mr. Speaker, and say that the School for the Deaf and various departments have made arrangements to take children to Grey River on certain designated holidays. This is true. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is neither getting into a point of order nor a point of privilege. The hon. member is, to my mind, abusing the privileges of other members. He is not making any prima facie case whatsoever.

MR. GILBERT:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled that the hon. member has not made a prima facie case.

MR. GILBERT:

On another point of privilege.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

As I understand a point of privilege it has to be raised at the earliest possible opportunity and it is a most serious matter. This particular member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir feels that his rights as a private member have

been infringed upon. A point of privilege is a serious matter that has to be raised at the earliest opportunity. We feel that he has to state his case of privilege, laying out the case, the truthful case of what happened with these children, otherwise the record will be distorted and tainted, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is getting ridiculous. There have been points of order raised in the most spurious fashion in this House. Then, because the hon. member cannot get his point of order recognized, which he certainly should not have, he jumps up and says, 'Oh, well, I will make it a point of privilege.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, page 11 states: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament..." And, further on, "A dispute arising between two members, as to allegation of facts, does not fulfill...", and so on and so forth. I mean, it is totally ridiculous that the hon. member feels that he has a right, just because he calls something a point of privilege, to take over this House. If the hon. member has a point of privilege, he should not be bringing it up at this late stage and in this spurious, frivolous fashion. His point of order was ruled out and he cannot then turn it into a point of privilege without making a mockery of this House. He should be ashamed of himself.

MR. TULK:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman on the other side can say exactly what he wants to say and he will still be wrong. Because the truth of the matter is that a point of privilege has to be raised not as he says. The hon. member is not raising it at a later point, he is raising it at the earliest possible opportunity.

DR. COLLINS:  
He was raising it just because he was refused a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Get Len Simms back, will you?

MR. TULK:  
Yes, get Simms back. The truth of the matter is, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has seen a case in this House where he believes that there have been facts presented that are wrong, that are misleading, and if presenting misleading facts to this House does not constitute a point of privilege, then, I ask Your Honour, what does?

The hon. Minister of Education should rise in his place and support him and tell him the real story, as he said he was going to do at the beginning.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, further to that point of privilege. I just read out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please!

We are dealing with the point of order now raised by the hon. member for St. Barbe. To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. minister's time has now elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:  
To a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To a point of privilege, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:  
The minister said that I had not told the whole truth. As a member of this House, I feel that my privilege has been interfered with. What happened was not what the minister outlined. What I am saying is it was not an ordinary weekend that those children wanted to go home for, it was for five days.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That is the point that the hon. member brought up and I have already said he has not made a prima facie case.

MR. SIMMONS:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, my friend from Burgeo

- Bay d'Espoir finds himself in a particular bind because of one of the more brilliant rulings made in this House recently. Some days ago it was ruled that it is unparliamentary to make a false statement, as the Chair will recall. It is unparliamentary in this House, only in this House, to make a false statement.

My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir heard the Minister of Education make a false statement, a statement that I can attest was false. It is contrary to fact. Now, whether he knows that is another question. But you understand the bind, Mr. Speaker, that given your brilliant ruling last week that you cannot make a false statement in this House, he was duty bound to raise a point of privilege to draw it to your attention that a member of this House had made a false statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he never got a chance to really state that point, so I state it on his behalf. I also want to record, Mr. Speaker, that I found it a bit surprising - I am sure the Chair had its reasons - not only to hear the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir did not have a point of privilege, but that the Chair found that he had abused the House, abused his privileges here by rising to point out that the gentleman over there had done something that is barefacedly unparliamentary, it is false.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I do not know what point of order the hon. member is attempting to make, but certainly he has not made one as yet.

MR. SIMMONS:

It comes generally under the category you cannot have your cake and eat it too. If it is false for us, it is false for him.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am asking the hon. member to make his point of order if he has one.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I ask the gentleman who occupies the Chair to insist that if falsehoods are unparliamentary they be equally unparliamentary for the Minister of Education as for us on this side.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, hon. member is getting very much to a comment that I would take exception to if he is suggesting that there is not equal fairness on each side given by the Chair. I do not think he quite said that, but he was certainly bordering on that interpretation.

There is no point of order.

MR. CALLAN:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, on Friday, three days ago, I asked the Minister of Transportation a couple of questions and the minister in answering said, "I think I will take that question as notice and supply the answer to the hon. gentleman as soon as I am able to get the information, possibly before one o'clock today." That was Friday. Monday passed, yesterday, and the minister did not come forward with the information and now today has



passed.

MR. BAIRD:

Do you ever need a house leader over there.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister, I am wondering why the information has not yet been tabled. It is three days now since the minister said that he would have it in in a couple of hours.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

#### Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3 - Concurrence motion (Government Services Committee).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port had finished his fifteen minutes in introducing Government Services.

The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) introduced the report from Government Services yesterday and he had some concerns about the fact that the committee system was not working. I would submit to him that I think the committee system is working but I would say that maybe the government is not working. I can tell him why the committee system is not working as it should, the reasons for it, and I attended those meetings, and

they were attended by Opposition members who had concerns and had questions to ask the ministers, but the point made was there were many questions asked but there were very few answers given to the questions. We were unable to get information when we talked about increases in the ministers offices of 140 per cent, in that range, we were unable to get answers that to us were satisfactory.

The other thing we found, when we were here in committees as such, was government members were sent here to protect the ministers and were asking motherhood and apple pie questions. It was boring, I would imagine, for people to have to sit and listen to the type of questions that were put to the ministers by government members, and it would want to make them leave. But, I would submit to this hon. House, the members of the Opposition were here to ask questions which they felt they were entitled to have answers to, questions concerning the operations of departments, not the type of verbage we were subjected to when the government members on those committees asked their questions. You would have to have a very strong constitution to be able to stand and listen to the type of questions that were asked by government members, and we wondered if men were asking questions or trained monkeys. We have some very serious doubts about that.

I would suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that the committee system works, but it would work much better if we did have full press coverage. I do agree with the member for Port au Port that the press coverage was not here as it should have been, because if it had the government members would not have

asked the type of questions they asked because they would have been laughed out of the Province. And maybe that is the reason why the press were not here, that they were almost as bored as those of us who had to come here and sit and listen to government members. Maybe they said, If this is the type of stuff that is happening, we will not come. But I think they should have, and I think they should have reported the type of questions put to the ministers by the government members who came to those committee meetings.

Now if you want to get into the Government Services Committee and the various departments are under that - Municipal Affairs, Public Works, Transportation, Labour, Consumer Affairs and Communications - there is enough there that we could have quite a time debating. But as the member for Port au Port, the Chairman of the Committee said, we did have two sessions on most of those. But on Municipal Affairs I think we could go on in this House for quite some time. It boils down to the fact that in March of this year, or let us go back to September of last year, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) promised the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities that he was going to provide the list for funding by March 31, and he was also going to set up an independent committee of officials from his department, the Department of Transportation and the Department of Environment to come up with a priority list for municipal funding.

Now we heard that this committee was set up. There is no doubt about it, the minister set up this committee. The only thing about it is I asked him questions in

this House in March of this year and, yes, he was going to have the list available before the end of the fiscal year, which was March 31. Then in his absence one day, early in April, I asked him the Premier, who guaranteed me that, yes, if the minister said that he would certainly ensure that the list would be made available before the House closed for the Easter recess.

But that did not happen. What we saw happen was the day that the House closed and everybody was scurried off to Florida or wherever they go on their holidays, all of a sudden government members started announcing municipal funding for their districts. Now the point that I questioned and the answers we tried to get in the committee - which, of course, we did not - was why, all of a sudden, was it so important, or why was it such a big thing that they had to wait until the House closed and then the government members had to go out and scurry off to their districts to announce municipal funding.

If, as the minister said, they were setting up a committee, a Capital Projects Board I believe it is called, to give priorities to municipal funding, why would it be necessary, I ask, Mr. Speaker, for the House to have to close and those grants come down to the Department of Municipal Affairs by Orders-in-Council and members had been already out announced them before the officials in the Department of Municipal Affairs knew that those grants were being made available. Now this to me backs up the point that we as members of the Opposition have maintained for the last two years we have been here in this House,

that municipal funding is an excuse to pork barrel political patronage of the worst kind, and I think this year it was the most blatant attempt ever to dispense these pork barrelling funds that the Tory members have used in their districts.

As I said previously in the Committee, I told the minister that when I was on the Town Council in Grand Falls I can remember when this system of political patronage started with the dispensing of grants, and that was back about 1979, I guess when this government took over. I know I heard one of the town officials in Grand Falls say, when he heard the member for Grand Falls announce the funding on the 60/40, 'My God, they have sunk to a new low. We never had this before. This is the first time that it was ever done by the member. This was always done by the deputy minister phoning the town manager and saying the grant was approved, or the grant for water and sewer was approved.'

Now seven or eight years ago, when this government took over, they decided that how they fund the municipal infrastructure in Newfoundland was going to become a political patronage thing. This to me, I would say, Mr. Speaker, sums up the effectiveness of this government. They have lost the will to govern and by doing this they have to sink to a situation where they have to distribute municipal funding on the basis of political patronage and political districts.

One of the interesting things I think that came out of that this year in municipal funding was the press reported initially that there was \$25 million went into

Tory districts and a little over \$2 million went into Liberal districts. I did some research on this, Mr. Speaker, and I found some interesting facts. First of all, the Liberal districts, for some reason or other, only needed \$20.50 per capita - that is what it worked out to this year in municipal grants for every person in a Liberal district - compared to \$70.60 for every person who is living in a Tory district. Now, this to me is a more vivid breakdown than the one you would have by saying \$2 million and \$25 million. This tells you some of the districts, so we will take the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. On a per capita basis there they got \$17.20. Let us go to Green Bay, the Premier's district, where it worked out to \$133.10 per person. Was there such a need in Green Bay more than in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir? We can go to St. Barbe, where it was \$14.60. Then we can go to Grand Bank where it was \$140.10 per person in Grand Bank. We will then go to Port de Grave, where they \$6.08 per person in that district compared to Harbour Grace, which got \$79.00 per person. Now, there is an interesting sort of comparison. Why would the people in Port de Grave get \$6.80 per capita for municipal funding when the people in Harbour Grace were entitled to \$79.00 per capita?

Now, that seems to me to sum it up, that is the sum and substance of what has happened to municipal funding in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, when you see the blatant way these funds were dispensed. When you take it on a per capita basis in the districts, remember every district in the Province has basically the same number of people in it. You are talking

from 9,000 to 12,000 people, so when you talk about a per capita distribution you are being fair and you are showing exactly the amount of pork barreling and the situation that evolved in municipal funding in this Province this year. There is a difference of \$50.00 that was given to every taxpayer in a Tory district compared to what was given to a taxpayer in a Liberal district.

What this says to me is that in a district like Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, where the taxpayers got \$17.20 per district, we have the two communities, Ramea and Burgeo, that contribute to the provincial economy in sales tax and their income tax somewhere in the vicinity of \$16 million a year, because you have in Ramea close to 500 people employed in a fish plant and in Burgeo it is closer to 700, so you have more people employed in those two towns than you have in the paper mills in Grand Falls and Corner Brook, contributing to the tax base of Newfoundland, yet the return is not there, they are not getting the return for their tax dollars, and this is why there is dissatisfaction with the distribution of municipal funding.

MR. WARREN:

Your time is up.

MR. GILBERT:

It must be hurting, is it?

You can apply that to every department in Government Services. The Department of Transportation is another one. The minister stood there in committee and, when I asked him questions concerning funding for the highways in Newfoundland, he again pointed out this year that there was still 3,300 kilometers

of unpaved road in the Province and 146 of it is in my district, in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. That is a district where the people are contributing more on a per capita basis to the economy, I would submit, than any other district in Newfoundland. That is the point that I am trying to make.

The citizens of Burgeo have written the Premier on a one-on-one basis during the last two months. He is now writing back and pointing out that over the last seventeen years \$27 million was spent in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and on the Burgeo highway - \$27 million over seventeen years. That is \$1.5 million a year, Mr. Speaker. He pointed out that there is \$30 million more required to finish paving that road. To those people who are contributing to the economy, and very high contributors to the economy of Newfoundland, at the rate of completion that the Premier has outlined in his letter, \$1.5 million a year, it is going to take another twenty years to pave the Burgeo road. That, I think, is a situation that again points out what the whole situation is about, that we have a government which have lost the will to govern and have gotten down to the point that they want to blame someone.

The budget that we are speaking on, and the overall picture here, came in and those people, the government, the minister when he was making up his budget, had to come up and blame someone. He was going to kick-start this whole situation, but the only people he was kicking, Mr. Speaker, were the people of rural Newfoundland and the people who were in the Liberal districts. He was not kicking anyone here in St. John's where

the Tories are, you have got no problem with him right here. But rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, suffered because of the inability of the members opposite to govern. This is where our serious problem is, and it is the one that I feel that people of Newfoundland are looking forward to getting a chance to tell the Premier what they think of what he has done with his mandate. We heard the Premier say in this House a few days ago that we might force him into calling an election. God, that we should! I hope we do. The people of Newfoundland should remember that two years ago the Premier called an election with the idea that he wanted to create jobs, and we know how many jobs he created, we know what the unemployment situation is in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have just listened, Mr. Speaker, for the last ten or fifteen minutes to the hon. member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). However, I still do not know what he is talking about. Mr. Speaker, he was talking about Municipal Affairs. I notice in the paper right here - and I know you are not supposed to quote from newspapers - but it says, 'Cottlesville Pleased With Co-operation.

MR. GILBERT:  
It was not Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read down here and I will quote what it says: 'We feel that if Mr. Carter does not change his tactic in dealing with government that the whole district, except Cottlesville, will continue to be ten to twenty years behind.' Now are you are talking about the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) or St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). Is Cottlesville in St. John's North?

MR. GILBERT:  
I do not know where it is.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is in St. John's North. It further says, 'When the MHA does not achieve anything for his district, how can he feel justified in accepting -'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir should realize that Cottlesville is not in a Tory district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I announced \$300,000 on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the district of Naskaupi. That is not in a Tory district. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I announced \$250,000 for Red Bay. Red Bay is not in a Tory district. Mr. Speaker, at the same time I announced \$200,000 for the district of Menihek. That was three announcements in a row, one, two, three, and not one of those announcements were in a Tory district.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Was either one in your own area?

MR. WARREN:

Red Bay is not in Torngat Mountains.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Where is it?

MR. WARREN:

It is not in Menihek, and it is not in Naskaupi. So I would assume it is in the hon. member for Eagle River's district.

MR. HISCOCK:

Liberal, DREE money.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying Liberal, DREE money? I should say to the hon. gentleman, it was his colleague, the hon. Mr. Rompkey, who has been trying, unsuccessfully, in the past couple of years, to diminish DREE, to get rid of DREE, to ask the Province to pay more money in Labrador. Here we are saying to the federal government, you have to give more money to Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, with the Department of Transportation, I was privileged to attend a press conference with the hon. John Crosbie, the acting Minister of Transportation, and the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HISCOCK:

DREE again.

MR. WARREN:

The hon. member says, DREE. The hon. member should realize what the cost-sharing is on the project.

MR. HISCOCK:

Seventy-five, one-third.

MR. WARREN:

Seventy-five, one-third. Now, you take \$6.08 million dollars, and the hon. gentleman just said it is

cost-shared by one-third. Now, one-third of \$6.08 million - I am not a very good mathematician, I should ask the member for Bonavista North to do it up - is roughly \$2 million. So, therefore, that is \$2 million from the Province in a Liberal district. And the hon. gentleman says it is DREE. So I say to the hon. gentleman, 'Yes, DREE is part of it.' DREE is two-thirds of \$6.08 million which is \$4 million.

MR. HISCOCK:

The water bombers were with Liberal money too.

MR. WARREN:

What did the hon. gentleman say?

MR. DINN:

Most Liberals do not pay taxes (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:

(Inaudible) a chance to have a job so we can pay them.

MR. WARREN:

I must say also, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) said that the people in Bay d'Espoir are paying more per capita than anywhere else in the Province. I should remind the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir that I have no roads in my district, absolutely no roads, but, Mr. Speaker, my constituents have to pay the per capita for other districts.

MR. CALLAN:

Do you have a stadium in Nain?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I should say to the hon. gentleman, it is getting awful, awful close. The engineering study is completed. The feasibility study is

completed. I would say to the hon. gentleman, read the papers around the middle of July, around the end of July, around the first of August, and he will see the contracts being called, I would think, for the start of the stadium in Nain.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Nain and Davis Inlet with the hon. Minister of Education (Ms Verge). We officially opened a \$5.1 million school in Nain. We were into Davis Inlet, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, everybody is asking me so much about what is going on in my district. I find it very interesting. When we are talk about the Department of Transportation, I believe I am concerned with the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). I am wondering if the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is going to find any money in his budget this year for the district of Bellevue?

MR. CALLAN:  
He found some.

MR. WARREN:  
He found some. Well, I want the Minister of Transportation to find more for Bellevue. I think he has to find more for Bellevue.

Mr. Speaker, I can only respond to the requests that I receive and I must say from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), my hon. colleague down there, all they have to do is ask the Rumbolts in Mary's Harbour or ask the Strugnells in Port Hope Simpson and in Charlottetown, and I would say to the hon. gentleman that - I will not say how many calls the hon. gentleman receives from the district of Eagle River, but I must say, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman, that I return a lot of calls that

I receive from the district.

MR. HISCOCK:  
I do too.

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that a person in Mary's Harbour would say after five months, "I have been trying to call our member and we cannot find him, we cannot locate him. So, can you help me find him?" And I said, "No, I cannot look after your member but what is your problem?" Subsequently they tell me their problems and so far I have been very fortunate to be able to help the member.

I have to tell the member though, I have to be honest with the member, I have to tell him this, I should tell him in all honesty that an election is going to be called very shortly, an election is going to be called very, very shortly, and I should tell hon. members, do not count me out of Eagle River yet, I mean, do not get too excited.

When the Minister of Education came back from Mary's Harbour, he said, "The call it out down there for me to run in Eagle River." In fact, the minister is excited.

MR. PEACH:  
Do you have your button made up?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I am making up my button for the next election and I am going to call it 'Four in one.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
I think I will call my button 'Four in one,' because, Mr.

Speaker, I cannot help it. If the hon. gentleman in Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and the hon. gentleman in Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and even my hon. friend who is not here today, I could tell you - I will not say the member for Bellevue is gone, I will not say the member for Eagle River is gone, but I will tell this much, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), you may as well kiss him good-bye because with the call out from Labrador City and Wabush we are going to see -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Do we have leave?

MR. WARREN:  
I would only want about a minute, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:  
Thirty seconds. Okay, I am going to clue up, Mr. Speaker, by saying to my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), he has been here now roughly a year or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no!

MR. WARREN:  
Six months. Okay, another six months an election will be over with. So I will say it is the shortest job the hon. member had for the last five years is the job

that he has now because I would think, Mr. Speaker, he has a revolving application on with Oxfam. I think he will have to go back to Oxfam. Tomorrow when I am going to have the chance, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the resolution, then I am going to devastate the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mitchell):  
The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As was pointed out by various members of the Opposition as well as the government members, the funding for water and sewer projects this year was \$25 million although \$250 million was applied for. This really points out how much we are falling back in our Province and not keeping up with the modernization and maintenance of existing services.

We also find out that we have places like Grand Falls, Gander, Exploits area that have bad drinking water. We find out we have the problem in St. Anthony with drinking water. We also find out we have the problem in Whitbourne, again, they have to boil their water. So here is a government after sixteen or seventeen years finding out that some of our major towns in this Province of ours have to boil water. We find out that requests have gone in for \$250 million and government has only allocated \$25 million.

Again, it was pointed out that the



district of Eagle River gets \$250,000 for Red Bay for a pumping system there. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before, this money was left over from the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement that was finished in March 31, of this year. We are looking forward to having a new agreement which is now gone to Ottawa by this government, and we will be able to see if the Tory Government in Ottawa is being as kind to Labrador as the Liberal Government in the past. Over \$39 million was spent by DREE in Coastal Labrador and \$13.5 million on the fishery. Out of that, \$16 million was spent on water and sewer. We had Cartwright getting so many phases, Mary's Harbour, Red Bay, L'Anse-au-Loup, Forteau, West St. Modeste, and L'Anse-au-Clair. The main reason why those towns got the money from DREE is that they agreed to put in property tax on their houses and what have you, whereas some of the other communities did not.

In writing, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as well as the Council of Cartwright, L'Anse-au-Loup, West St. Modeste, and Forteau, they had to get involved with the cost sharing, 60/40. The deputy minister, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, all of them said one thing. 'We do not want Coastal Labrador getting involved on this cost sharing programme of 60/40, because there is such a small population base in those communities and if we have to start giving them this cost-shared programmes of \$1 million or \$1.5 million, then most of the money that they are collecting from their own property tax and poll tax etc., is going to service the debt and just paying off the

interest, and not get at the capital. As a result, these smaller towns in Coastal Labrador will get into great financial difficulty, will have to raise the property tax and poll tax and find out they are still in difficulty.

So what the Province wants to do and maintains is they want a new Coastal Labrador DREE agreement so they can get more money for water and sewer and then put those systems into Cartwright, L'Anse-au-Loup, Pinaware, Black Tickle and other communities along the Coast of Labrador so that they are given the system tax free, free of costs, and all they have to do then is maintain the system by collecting the property tax and poll tax.

This is, for the most part, acceptable to many of the communities, but many of the communities still feel that they have the right to get in under this cost sharing programme. But again, the government in St. John's is telling the people what is better for them in Labrador. The people of Cartwright, in particular, feel that they should be able to go and get cost shared money and finish their last phase.

It was also mentioned with regard to the money for the Red Bay road, the \$6.08 million, that this again comes out of a federal Liberal programme for airstrips. The federal government said, 'If we put the \$3.8 million towards the Red Bay Road, then will you do some matching?' Much to the federal government's surprise and much to the Province's surprise, they agreed.

I have the honour or the privilege or the unfortunate circumstance to have bordering in my district the

Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. Mr. Mulroney. Writing back and forth to his office, I have been telling him that anything that is good for the district of Eagle River, from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, is also good for his area, because the ferry comes into Blanc Sablon. We use the airstrip. Many people feel that Labrador should have their own ferry coming into Labrador, and the airstrip in Labrador itself. But they are federal, they are much larger and the cost factor of the federal subsidy is almost \$750,000 for the ferry.

I have pointed out the main attraction Red Bay has in the Basques whaling site. Of course, any tourist that comes into Labrador has to pass through the Prime Minister's district. I am not surprised that the federal government has put pressure on the provincial government and said, 'Will you do some matching?' It was not the intention of the provincial government to get into matching, but they had to do it or else they would lose the \$3.8 million.

Now we have other jurisdictions in Labrador that the federal government is being involved with. That is again the airstrip programme, and also, as I said before, with the Coast of Labrador, DREE, and the fishery. Now, it has gone to the Conservative Government.

Some of the members here are saying we are going to have an election. Well, I welcome one, because in the last election we heard one speech in that election, and that speech was, 'Put the two governments together, in Ottawa and in St. John's, of the same political colour.' The people

were told if they did that, they would end up getting more gravy and more money out of Ottawa, and the wheels of industry would turn so much that we would also have full employment.

What has happened since then? We have had the Premier make a statement that he had better co-operation under Prime Minister Trudeau than he is having under Mulroney. Also, now we have a Coastal Labrador DREE agreement gone to Ottawa and we are still waiting for that agreement to be signed.

So I would say to the minister and to the Premier, before he starts coming to Labrador and before he starts saying to the people, 'Put us back. We are the same political stripe,' he better start delivering some of the goods and programmes from Ottawa.

The Agricultural Department is still looking for its agreement. Small business is still looking for its agreement. Tourism is still looking for its agreement, and Coastal Labrador DREE. I can go on with other programmes that are waiting to be signed. For example, another one is now going on five years, the secondary roads agreement.

So I would say, if the Premier is going to go and beat his chest and give the message that we need another mandate to create jobs, then I would suggest that he had better get some of these agreements signed from Ottawa.

We have in Labrador, and the members for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), and Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) know full well, better than any other members in this House, that

Labrador has the feeling we pay a lot in taxes from the revenues from mining; from the base down in Goose Bay; from the gas and oil people who were drilling off the Coast of Labrador; from the fishery; from the forestry; as well as Churchill Falls. There is not enough revenue from Churchill Falls but we do get quite a lot from it.

All that money goes in to service projects on the Island part of our Province and very little is put back into Labrador. When anything is put back into Labrador, it is always on a cost shared basis and the federal government is the one that has to come up with the majority of that money.

The former Minister of Fisheries and Rural Development, Mr. Goudie, who was here, made a statement down in Goose Bay which was quite correct. The people in Labrador do feel that St. John's does not care about them, does not understand them and always looks for Ottawa to give them money.

The people of Labrador would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that they could look at a road in that area and say it was 100 per cent funded by the provincial government or go into a hospital in that district and say it was 100 per cent funded by the provincial government. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) just mentioned the school in Nain, \$5.5 million, again, cost shared by the federal government.

The people of Labrador are beginning to say, 'When is the Province going to start spending 100 per cent of its own money in Labrador?'

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What for?

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, for example, the road from Lodge Bay to the airstrip, which is a provincial road of less than a mile, Mr. Speaker. The federal government gave an airstrip costing \$2.7 million and what do we have? People have to walk from that community to get to the airstrip or in the Winter go by skidoo. So that is one example.

A small road from Mary's Harbour to Lodge Bay needs a bridge.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

In that case, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to talking about the Lodge Bay bridge later. Hopefully the provincial government will come up with its own funding. If we were in government we would be doing it and not always relying on Ottawa.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one thing that the hon. gentleman said about 100 per cent provincial financing. Last Fall, a quarter mile road from the airstrip in Hopedale to the community, a quarter of a mile, \$200,000, 100 per cent provincial money.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

It only again points out, Mr. Speaker, that when there is any money - \$200,000 - when you consider the amount of taxes that comes out of Labrador and the member for Torngat Mountains has the audacity to get up and pound his chest and say, \$200,000! Why do we not get \$20 million to help do the Trans-Labrador highway, finish the Red Bay road and do more water and sewerage projects? \$200,000! The Premier, my dear, Mr. Speaker, in his office spends that much on meals, entertainment and liquor for his guests.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few brief comments in the debate now before the House. Of course, as my colleague from Burgeo and the gentleman from Eagle River have already pointed out, I think it is pretty obvious now that this government, and especially the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), is guilty of probably the most blatant, the most unconscionable and the rottenest kind of political pork barrelling in the history of this Province.

If the hon. members opposite are

not prepared to accept that then, Mr. Speaker, there are figures and facts to prove it. I have them here and I am quite willing and quite prepared to table those statistics.

Let us go down through the list, Mr. Speaker. Bonavista North this year will receive in water and/or sewer grants and roads grants \$13.60 per person. Every man, woman and child living in Bonavista North this year will receive \$13.60 as their share of the government spending.

Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, is not to unlike Bonavista South. Both are rural districts, both have a sprinkling of semi-urban make-up. For example, Bonavista pretty well compares with Wesleyville and on and on it goes.

Bonavista South, the district represented by a member of the government side, this year will receive \$68.50. There is \$13.60 for the people of Bonavista North, and their fellow Newfoundlanders, with almost identical problems in Bonavista South, will receive \$68.50 as their share of the money spent this year on municipal services.

Let us take the district of St. Barbe, which is a rural constituency. It will receive this year \$14.60 per head as their share of the money being spent this year by the provincial government. Well, Mr. Speaker, St. Barbe is a bigger district and it is certainly more difficult to service. The needs are probably greater. Let us compare it with the district of Bay of Islands. Both are rural Newfoundland districts. St. Barbe, I think, is certainly more behind in terms of

amenities that are needed.

Bay of Islands will be getting this year \$81.20 and the people in St. Barbe, Newfoundland taxpayers, will receive \$14.60.

Let us look at the district of Stephenville, a semi-urban district. The town of Stephenville has been there now for a large number of years and, I suppose, they do have a certain amount of essential services provided. This year the district of Stephenville will receive \$43.50 per head.

Let us compare that, for example, with the district of Carbonear, which is similar in many respects. Carbonear this year will receive \$92.30, a little more than double that which every man, woman and child in Stephenville will receive.

Bellevue, the district represented by my colleague here, will receive nil, nothing at all for Bellevue. Bellevue is not unlike a number of other districts, for example, maybe Ferryland district. In terms of the miles of roads and the number of communities and the nature, Bellevue and Ferryland have a lot in common. In Bellevue this year there will not be one cent spent by this government.

In the district of Ferryland, again, a district represented by the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) will receive \$70.80 per person.

Fortune - Hermitage, again a rural Newfoundland constituency, this year will receive \$5.05 per capita. Let us compare that, for example, with Grand Bank which is, I think, a reasonably good

comparison, Grand Bank as opposed to Fortune - Hermitage. Both are fishing areas and both have a sprinkling of semi-urban and rural Newfoundland.

Fortune - Hermitage will receive \$5.05, while a district held by the member from the other side of the House from Grand Bank, the people up there will receive \$140.10 per capita, Mr. Speaker, compared to \$5.50 for Port de Grave.

Let us look at my district, Twillingate. This year Twillingate will receive \$20 per head. Twillingate is not too unlike Green Bay in terms of geography and the nature of the economy in the area, Twillingate \$20, lo and behold, Green Bay, \$133. One hundred and thirty-three dollars for Green Bay and \$20, Mr. Speaker, for Twillingate.

I have mentioned, I think, Bay d'Espoir, or my colleague mentioned Bay d'Espoir \$17.20 per head in Bay d'Espoir. I do not have - yes, I do have Kilbride here, \$17.20 for Bay d'Espoir, now let me see a district similar to Bay d'Espoir would be - I do not have the full list here. Oh I would probably think Burin - Placentia West would compare with Bay d'Espoir in terms of geography and again the nature of the economy, \$17.20 for Bay d'Espoir, but for the district of Burin - Placentia West we have \$87.70.

Mr. Speaker, on and on it goes. How any member opposite can stand up in his place and deny what members on this side are saying, that there is political patronage, then I think they are being less than honest. They are not fooling anyone, least of all the public

because the people in rural Newfoundland today know very well what is happening. They know very well.

Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, let me just go back over this list. Let us take the district of Port de Grave. Port de Grave is similar in almost every respect with the districts of Harbour Grace and the district of Carbonear. In Port de Grave this year, the good people of Port de Grave, all producers, I suppose there is not a community in Newfoundland where there is less welfare, or less people on unemployment insurance, good primary producers. That district this year will get \$6.80 per capita. And then we go to Carbonear, \$92.30.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What a member!

MR. W. CARTER:  
It is hard to imagine, is it not? Then, of course, let us look at Harbour Grace compared to Port de Grave. Again, Port de Grave gets \$6.80, Harbour Grace, \$79.00.

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is no laughing matter. Maybe the members opposite might be treating it lightly -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Good members boy.

MR. W. CARTER:  
- but when you realize that they are now playing with the health and safety and the lives of many thousands of Newfoundlanders, then I think that it is time to draw the line. I can take my district and give it as an example.

In my district today we have raw sewerage on the sides of the roads in many places.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Do I have leave to continue, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
You may continue.

MR. W. CARTER:  
In my district we have raw sewerage, Mr. Speaker, in many communities on the sides of the roads and yet this government dares to play with the lives of those people by practicing what I consider again to be the worst kind of blatant, unconscionable political pork-barrelling, and that is exactly what they are doing.

Of course I can go on. I can talk about the need for road paving in most rural Newfoundland communities and districts, and again I can mention Twillingate district. This morning I had a phone call from a leading citizen in Herring Neck, for example, telling me that yesterday they reactivated the fish plant in that community and that this morning they are going to be hauling thousands of tons of cod fish fillet over that road. She said that it is literally impossible to drive over that road from Herring Neck to the main road going across New World Island with pot holes and dust.

You have 150 people working in that plant, many of whom travel over that road coming from nearby communities, like Cobbs Arm, Pikes

Arm, Newville, and Indian Cove, all forced to travel over roads, Mr. Speaker, that are, to say deplorable is an understatement.

Then, of course, the sad part about it is that in one breath we hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and rightly so - I think everybody in Newfoundland realizes the need to produce a good quality fish that is going into the U.S. markets and other markets. Yet the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will then turn a blind eye to the need to upgrade the roads over which this fish must be transported.

How can we expect to produce a high quality product and demand the top price in the market place when it is being hauled over roads that have the result of beating that fish to a pulp before it gets to its final processing place?

So, Mr. Speaker, I say the government is pork barrelling and I say it is to their shame. I suppose one would be naive if we thought that governments did not favour their own kind. That is the name of the game I suppose. But certainly when it has become so blatant, as I have pointed out in these statistics, where, as I said, Port de Grave district will get \$6.80 and then districts that are almost identical, Harbour Grace and Carbonear, are getting more than ten times as much, getting twelve or fifteen times as much.

So, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), living in a district where, I suppose, even the sidewalks are all provided, concrete sidewalks, he can very well sit back and smugly make fun and joke and laugh

and sneer.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would not want the member to allow mistaken information to get out to the public. There are still a few unpaved roads in St. John's North. I am not happy about them. I have made representations to the city council. Unfortunately, it is not something over which I, or even this government, has direct control. Our requests have to be filtered through the city council.

So, while I deplore it, I must say I cannot take any of the blame for it. I have made an effort and I will continue to make such an effort. But the hon. member's district is not the only one with unpaved roads.

I would be very interested, if he has all these lovely figures, which I would question, by the way, if he would read out the St. John's figures.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. member, I think, answered his own question. In St. John's North, I suppose every single road in that district comes under the auspice of the St. John's municipal council. So, you know,

what justification is there for the hon. member to have any allocation in these estimates for St. John's North when all of his needs, water and sewer, road paving, sidewalks, street lighting, garbage collection -

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

The member certainly knows better. To get an accurate, per capita figure you would have to take the total number of people in St. John's North and divide by some reasonable per capita basis for the entire City of St. John's. Now, the member knows full well that the City of St. John's get a very generous grant from the provincial government. It is not as generous as some of the smaller communities get because once you get over, I think, 100,000 in population, the grant is considerably less. But the per capita grant to St. John's from this government is quite high, quite substantial.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I should not engage the hon. member, because he knows, as I know -

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. W. CARTER:

- and as the members of the House know, that you cannot, in all fairness, compare conditions in an urban seat, for example, like St. John's North or St. John's Centre or St. John's East or Pleasantville or St. John's West, as you would in a seat like Twillingate, for example.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of protest. This is not fair. It is true that there are differences in an urban centre like St. John's and some of the rural areas in the member's district, but I would point out that some of our services are much more fragile. If we get a sleet storm, the entire city can be knocked out. You can have a relatively simple accident, in which no one is hurt, and yet a pole is knocked down or damaged and whole sections of the city are put out, and I would remind the member that these days most houses are completely dependent upon electricity. So, while we may have some advantages, we also have a great many disadvantages.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have heard arguments from both sides and there is no point of order.

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not want to engage the hon. member in an argument because he knows it is like comparing apples with oranges to compare a St. John's seat to a rural seat.

By the way, while we are talking about the St. John's seats, maybe the hon. member does not know, but the city of St. John's which has a population, according to these statistics, of 63,797 voters, I presume, will be getting \$30.30 per capita this year.



MR. J. CARTER:

That is the wrong book.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, it is not the wrong book, and I challenge the hon. member to present the other facts.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are (inaudible) thousand people in the city of St. John's, anybody knows that, any Kindergarten child knows that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the districts of St. John's Centre, St. John's East Extern, St. John's North, St. John's South, and St. John's West, in those five provincial districts there is a total of 63,797 people and this year they will receive a total of \$1,934,000, which comes to \$30.30 per head for every single person living in those five provincial districts, including the one represented by my hon. friend across the way.

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. member is going to table those?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, we will table them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member in his opening statement said that he had facts that he was going to read from. If the document that he is referring to is factual, I think the rules of the House require that he would table it in order to quote from it.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Speaker said if they are accurate. Well, I can tell you now they are accurate.

MR. J. CARTER:

Then table them.

MR. W. CARTER:

I am quite prepared to table these.

MR. SPEAKER:

In order to read them into the record, the hon. member should be willing to table them.

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just for a point of clarification.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

This document was tabled a week and a half ago.

MR. TOBIN:

Table it again.

MR. W. CARTER:

At the outset I said I would be prepared to table this document, and it still holds. I am prepared to table it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been given leave, but I will not take advantage of that. I will take my seat now in a moment, but, certainly, again I want to make it quite clear that certain members opposite, not all of them, appear to be getting a charge out of this and sitting back and smugly jeering and laughing and snickering at some of the comments I have made. Well, I can only say

to them that if they were representing a rural Newfoundland district where you had people who were forced to live under conditions that are long passed in St. John's, for example, long passed, then, Mr. Speaker, I think they would have a little better understanding of just how serious the problem is and maybe they would not be so content to just sit back and poke fun at some of the comments made, especially by my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir earlier this afternoon.

There is a very serious problem and this government, Mr. Speaker, has elected to ignore it. And in order to save their political hides and to cling on with their fingernails, they are now practicing what I consider to be the cheapest and the most unconscionable act of political pork barrelling that this Province has ever witnessed.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I think that one has to bring the other side of this issue up. The hon. member has stated that there is insufficient spending on public services in rural areas, and who can disagree with that? Everyone knows that. The reason for it, of course, is that there just is not enough money in the Province. It is not that the government is not trying to fulfill a need, but the need is extremely large; the figures have been quoted before. I think there was something over \$100 million demands and each year we can only come up with roughly \$25 million to take care of these demands. Of

course, it is not just to take care of \$100 million demands, that is just the amount of the demands this year, I am sure next year there will be another \$100 million. No matter how much we spend, there is not a decline in the total amount because the expectation for services throughout the Province is escalating. Again, that is a fact of life. It is not a complaint or criticism, because the escalation and expectations are going on throughout the country. We are lagging behind. We pointed out that even though we are very much better off than when we joined Confederation, we are still no nearer the current average in public services than we were when we started in Confederation. So, no matter how much we put in, we are not getting any closer and that is because there is such a huge amount we have to put in and our economy has not been developed in a way that will allow us to close the gap.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to, therefore, change our economy and the amount of money that we can generate in this Province and we are doing it in two ways: Firstly, we are pointing out to the federal government that this is a confederation we live in, that in any one area it is not only the responsibility of the local government in that area to provide economic stimulus and economic growth and jobs and wealth, it is also in each area the responsibility of the federal government. If it was not a joint responsibility we should not have a confederation, we should have a bunch of states lying next to one another and exchanging diplomatic representations, or whatever. But that is not Canada. Canada is a confederation. So in this

Province the federal government has a responsibility, just as this provincial government has, for economic growth and economic opportunity. We pointed out to them that they are not fulfilling their role. Because if they were, after thirty-eight years we would be much nearer the Canadian average than we are.

So that is our first approach: We are saying to the federal government, you have to bring in more effective policies to let us get nearer the Canadian average so we can do what the hon. member wants, and what we want, and what everyone else wants to improve public services throughout the Province.

Now, the second thing we are doing is we are saying to our own people, in the past there were certain megaprojects that were very, very helpful to our economy; there was the building of Churchill Falls, there was the building of the Trans-Canada highway, there was the building of our school system, which, of course, expanded rapidly after Confederation, there was the building of our vocational school system, the building of our university and many other things, and these were all quite large projects which could rate the name mega, they were in the millions of dollars. Now, megaprojects, for whatever reason, have gone a bit out of fashion. I do not think we should neglect the thought entirely, because we have a few megaprojects we want to get going: The offshore oil and gas resource is certainly worthy of the name megaproject and we certainly want to get that going. We want to restructure our inshore fishery and in many respects, even though that will be done in bits

and pieces, all-over-the-Province type of thing, if you wrap it all together that certainly rates the name megaproject. So we certainly are not going to abandon the thought of megaprojects, however, we have to realize that it looks as though, even if we got all the available megaprojects going, that will not be sufficient for our people to get meaningful jobs, to have enough wealth for the provincial government to be able to raise sufficient taxes out of that wealth, and so on and so forth, to reach our expectations. So we have to put in something in addition to the megaprojects and that is what we are doing: We are trying to promote entrepreneurship, that is the single person or the small numbers of people or the small groups of people who will begin to create wealth, they will not just rely on the megaprojects coming along and getting things going. I am not knocking megaprojects, as I mentioned, they are very good, but there has to be the additional.

Now, I saw something on television the other night which I think certainly brought this point home to me and I thought it was a little bit pathetic. There was a fisherman who was interviewed and he was asked by the interviewer, "What are you doing now?" He said, "I am preparing for the inshore fishery." "Oh," the interviewer said, "that is fine. And what were you doing before doing this?" The fisherman said, "Well, I was doing nothing." The interviewer asked, "What do you do after this preparation?" The fisherman said, "Well, I am going to prosecute the fishery, obviously." And then the interviewer got back to one of the original questions and said, "What was it you were doing before you

began to prepare for the inshore fishery?" He said, "Nothing." The interviewer said, "Why not?" The fisherman said, "There is nothing to do around here."

Now, this is not a criticism of that fisherman. That fisherman lived in a rural community with vastly unsatisfied needs in terms of public services, in terms of, I suppose, even just general clean-up around the community, and so on and so forth. So what I am suggesting is, just as the individual now has to take an entrepreneurial look at life and economic development and their own ability to generate wealth, I think the municipalities have to take an entrepreneurial look at things. They cannot any longer depend only on the provincial government or, indeed, on the federal government. That is like our depending on megaprojects. Megaprojects are not going to do enough for us. I suggest that the municipalities should not depend only on the federal and provincial governments, because the federal and provincial governments are not going to be able to do enough. They are going to do their part, but that is not going to meet the expectations.

So I think the municipalities have to order their affairs, such that they, themselves, take on more and more of the responsibility of getting their own public services up to some acceptable standard. Now, they are doing that, obviously; they are putting in new tax measures, and so on and so forth, but that, to me, does not seem to be innovative enough. I think they can arrange campaigns amongst people who live in communities, when they are not otherwise occupied, and they will therefore be able to generate a

work force and be able to generate projects that can be handled by that work force.

Now, I would like to give an example: In a way it is not a direct municipal example, I suppose, but I would like to give an example from my own district about the sort of approach to life I mean. There was a family up on Shea Heights in my district which consisted of a mother and a child. They were on welfare, so they had very limited means. They lived in a small house, the small house burned down and they were literally destitute. Now, they had an alternative, they could have applied to the Department of Social Services and undoubtedly they would have found them accommodations somewhere; it probably would not have been on Shea Heights because there is not that much accommodation of that sort available up there. But they did not want to leave Shea Heights, so what happened? Certain people in the community itself got together and they went to the Department of Social Services and they said, "If you give us the materials, we will supply all the other things that are necessary; we will supply the electricians, we will supply the carpenters, we will supply the roofers, we will supply the people who are knowledgeable in concrete, we will supply the people who can build a chimney", and that type of thing. A deal was struck and that family were accommodated, were housed in an area of their choice and in better housing than they started with. And this was very largely, not totally, as I mentioned, a community effort. Now, if people in the community had been asked to contribute money for that new house they would not have been able to do so, they did

not have it, many of them were on welfare themselves. But they had available skills and available time to be able to achieve something for that family. And I am suggesting that municipalities that lack services, they will have to try to put that type of approach in place.

Now, this is not passing the buck. I am saying that I do not think the expectations which are rising all the time will ever be able to be met by totally relying on central governments, be it provincial or federal. There has to be more and more of a push by the municipalities to do this themselves. And I do not think they can do it totally through the tax route, because, again, the tax route is not going to give enough money, they will have to organize things. And this is not by any means strange to the Newfoundland tradition. Before Confederation, certainly, and even in the early days of Confederation, people in the communities got together and they built community wharves, they built community stages and they built walkways. You go out to Brigus, for instance, and you will find out in Brigus many places that were built purely by hand by the people of the community.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder if I could ask the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I apologize to my colleague

because in his rebuttal to -

MR. TULK:

You will not get an answer from him.

MR. W. CARTER:

I think we will. I think the hon. minister is a fair-minded person and he very carefully, Mr. Speaker, skirted around the issue. He talked about the lack of funding and the lack of Ottawa's participation in funding, but I wonder if the minister could explain to the House and to the people of Newfoundland, especially the people who live in districts that are represented in this House by members on this side, how it is that in the fifteen Liberal districts in Newfoundland there is a total of \$25.90 per capita of government spending this year on water and/or sewer and roads, \$25.90 for fifteen Liberal districts on an average, and how is it, Mr. Speaker, that in the remaining districts, those represented by members opposite, there is a total of \$70.60? The figures -

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The hon. member is getting into a lengthy question. Would he please pose his question to the minister?

MR. W. CARTER:

Getting into what, Mr. Speaker? What am I getting into?

MR. SPEAKER:

You asked the hon. member if he would permit a question.

MR. W. CARTER:

Of course I asked him.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand from the hon. member now that he is building it into

two or three questions.

MR. W. CARTER:

Why not?

MR. TULK:

He could go on for 10 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognized the hon. member for Twillingate to ask a question of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). The hon. member that I wanted to recognize to speak next was the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I recognized the member for Twillingate to ask a question. He got on his feet, he asked the Chair if he could ask a question and I granted that privilege. If he abuses that privilege, I will have to take it away from him.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have ten minutes that I can stand in my place. Mr. Speaker, you seem to forget the whole exercise of this debate is to question the ministers. Is the Speaker saying that it is improper for us to question ministers?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is just a slight misunderstanding here and that is all there is to it. I think the hon. the Speaker thought that the hon. member was rising just to ask a question on my time and not to engage in another ten minute part in the debate. That was my understanding of what the hon. the Speaker thought was happening.

We often do that. We often say,

would you permit a question? We permit a question, a question is asked briefly, and then the member who is originally speaking gets up and may or not answer the question but anyway he carries on. I suggest that is what the Speaker thought was happening here. I think the misunderstanding was the hon. member felt that he was now, and as is his right, has the right to get up and go on for another ten minutes.

MR. TULK:

To that point or order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

There was a point of order raised.

The Speaker, may have indeed thought that he was recognizing the hon. gentleman for a question and that he was going to recognize the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), but the Speaker did not recognize the member for Eagle River. The hon. gentleman's time had expired, his time was up, and it was the time for somebody on this side to speak as is traditional in this House, back and forth across the House. The member for Eagle River was not recognized.

Mr. Speaker, you have to reconsider this because we are establishing a precedent here which is contrary to the rules of this House. The fact of the matter is that once the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) was recognized, and he was not cutting in on the minister's time because that had expired, once he was recognized, he then has ten minutes to ask any questions in the committee which we are in, in

the Concurrence Debate. As a matter of fact, if we stick strictly to the rules, but by agreement we have agreed on the ten minute sessions, he has a half an hour strictly by the rules, but by agreement we have agreed to this ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I was under the impression when the hon. member for Twillingate stood up to speak that he wanted permission from the Chair to pose a question to the hon. minister. I granted that because of the fact that he had spoken previously to the hon. the Minister of Finance. The Chair was going to recognize the hon. the member for Eagle River. But in my ruling now, if the hon. member for Twillingate wants to take up to ten minutes in this debate, he may do so.

Thank you.

MR. W. CARTER:

You had me worried there for a while, Mr. Speaker. We do not have many privileges in this House, that is for sure, and I would not want to think that we are going to be denied the privilege of asking ministers questions during this very important debate. I should remind the Speaker that the hon. member who was about to be recognized obviously was quite willing to defer to this member.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Finance now to explain to the people of Newfoundland, the people of all Newfoundland, because I think there is a common decency amongst all Newfoundlanders and they do not appreciate seeing their fellow Newfoundlanders being put down or discriminated against. They

believe in fair play.

How can the minister explain the per capita spending in fifteen Liberal districts this year will amount to \$25.90 per person when, for the same services in the districts represented by members opposite, the per capita spending will be \$70.60? \$25.90 per capita in Liberal districts, \$70.60 cents per capita in P.C. districts. Will the minister explain that?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am allowed.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, no not a point of order, I wish to be recognized, Mr. Speaker. It is not a point of order. I wish to be recognized to speak.

MR. W. CARTER:

The Minister of Finance can answer now.

MR. J. CARTER:

He can if he wants to, but I can get up. I have a perfect right as the hon. gentleman has to get up and be recognized. I wish to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North can be recognized if he is making -

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, I wish to make a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

- a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, no, I wish to address the

House.

MR. BUTT:

It is his turn to speak now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is back and forth.

MR. J. CARTER:

Back and forth, the member for Twillingate did ask.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair recognized the hon. the member for Twillingate for ten minutes. His time allotted in the debate was at twenty minutes after five, and he has until 5:30.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

It is time we got a bit of fair play in this place.

MR. W. CARTER:

Your Honour has restored my faith, Sir, in our parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance is not prepared to answer that question or if the Minister of Finance cannot do it, then how can we expect the member for St. John's North to do it?

Mr. Speaker, I have another five minutes left in my allotted time of ten minutes. I am prepared now, Mr. Speaker, to yield to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance got up a moment ago and talked about mega projects and about Ottawa not coming through with sufficient funds to put in water and sewer systems and paved roads.

I do not know how he can blame Ottawa for the unfairness, for the

inequitable way that they have this year shared up the federal spending around this Province. I have heard the minister blame Ottawa for a lot of things, and I have heard the government opposite blame Ottawa for a lot of things, but now they are trying to blame Ottawa for the unfair and inequitable way that they allocated monies this year under their Capital Works Programme.

So I again ask the minister, and I am quite willing, Mr. Speaker, to again defer to the minister if he indicates to me that he is prepared to even try to answer that question. How come it is \$25.90 in Liberal districts and \$70.60 in districts held by members opposite?

I would like for the Minister of Transportation to be here for example and to try and rationalize how it is that certain districts, districts held by members opposite, have every road paved. I am told in the minister's own district, by the way, there is not a square foot of gravel road left. In fact, I am told in the minister's district roads to Summer cottages have been paved.

Yet, in Twillingate district, and other rural Newfoundland districts, where we have roads to fish plants over which fish has to be transported over to and from the main processing plant, we have dusty roads and pot hole ridden roads, roads that certainly add nothing to improving the quality of that fish. How can the Minister of Transportation square that? How can he square providing pavement for almost all of the roads in some districts and yet in certain other rural Newfoundland districts ignoring them altogether.



So, Mr. Speaker, again I would ask the minister to try and tell the House why the discrimination. How does he square what they will spend this year in Tory districts as opposed to what they plan on spending in Liberal districts?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I understand, Mr. Speaker, we are in the Concurrence Debate. Yesterday we had the Chairman of this Committee stand in this Legislature and berate the Opposition and berate the press because they did not attend Committee meetings. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to look at the government benches over there. What departments are we discussing this afternoon? Finance. He is in his place, the Minister of Finance. Public Works and Services, where is he?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we have to have the ministers here in order to ask them questions. Where is the Minister of Transportation? We might as well close this place down if those people are not going to come in and answer questions on their departments. That is the purpose of this debate. It is to put questions and to answer them. And we have no ministers.

MR. HISCOCK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have ruled there is no point of order.

MR. HISCOCK:

A new point of order. I would like to call a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is regrettable that the ministers are not in their place, particularly the ones that we are doing. We got into committee meetings where the main thing is, Mr. Speaker, to have them scrutinized. We also ended up keeping so many hours to have questions raised in the House through the ministers, so again the press and the public could have an opportunity to hear. It is very difficult for the press to cover all these committee meetings and this is the reason why this was set aside, to have other questions asked in this House. It is also regrettable that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) questions and he refused to answer them.

There is one programme that this government has, Mr. Speaker, and it is in the Department of Municipal Affairs where 75/25 is cost shared in fire-fighting equipment, 75 per cent by the Province and 25 per cent by the municipalities. If there is any programme that is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, it is anything that can preserve life and property.

With that, last year was the first year that they brought it up to \$1 million from \$750,000. This government allocates only \$750,000 for fire-fighting equipment. Last year it went up to \$1 million. This year it is gone up to \$2 million and requests have come in from municipalities all across this Province amounting to \$7 million to preserve property, life, hospitals, schools, etc. One of the things that I am concerned with, Mr. Speaker, of this \$7 million is we are only asking for \$7 million, not \$250 million, like they are asking for water and sewerage, not the untold millions they are asking for roads. The people of this Province are only asking for \$7 million to bring us up to a standard of fire-fighting equipment in this Province which will preserve life.

My concern is this government is going to be true to its track record, like when they allocated water and sewerage projects on the basis of political patronage and when they announced funding roads, they did it on the basis of political patronage. Now that we have this programme, within the next week or two the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) will be announcing who the municipalities and councils that are successful in obtaining

funding from the provincial government for fire-fighting equipment.

We are not talking about all fire trucks either, Mr. Speaker. I know at least several communities in my district in the past four or five years have asked for a pump and so much hose and fire-fighting outfits for the firemen. The Minister of Finance said, 'The municipalities should take more in their hands and do more for themselves.' Now here is an example that the majority of firefighters in this Province are volunteers, they are putting their lives in jeopardy, they are preserving the property of private people, hospitals, schools, fish plants, etc., and all they are asking, Mr. Speaker, is to be funded. They are only asking for \$7 million and we are only giving \$2 million.

I am afraid with this attitude of this government that when it comes to political patronage that the Tory people are the ones that are blessed by God and that the Liberals are damned to damnation and to the devil, so what they will end up doing is when the funding comes, life will not be looked upon as with equality. They will go and fund fire-fighting equipment and trucks and pumps and hoses and outfits to only Tory, Conservative community districts.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept anything but what I am saying because I have known of several communities in my district in the past several years have applied for this programme and they were told in 1980 or 1981, 'We have not got enough money. We only have \$750,000. Therefore, you have not got it this year, you

will get it next year.' Next year, 'We have not got it this year, you will get it next year.' So 1982 comes and 1983 and 1984 and 1985. I am talking about isolated districts, communities, along the Labrador Coast that are not like Shea Heights. Fire-fighting equipment can come from various areas of the city and from Mount Pearl and from Conception Bay South and from Holyrood. I am not talking about Harbour Grace where they can come from Port de Grave and Carbonear and other areas.

I am talking about St. Lewis, which is completely isolated; I am talking about Mary's Harbour, Port Hope Simpson, Pinware, Williams Harbour and all they are asking for - they are not asking for fire trucks - they are just asking for a pump and some hose, \$30,000 or \$40,000. They have been asking for four or five years and the answer they have been given is, "We cannot give it to you this year, but we will give it to you next year." The next year comes and they will get it.

MR. HEARN:

Cartwright has a fire truck.

MR. HISCOCK:

The Minister of Education is quite correct, Cartwright got a fire truck. The reason why Cartwright got a fire truck is CBC happened to be in doing a story on the closing of the coast guard station and a building burned down. The cameras were there and they brought up the issue that I am bringing up now.

I have had at least eight people burned to death in the district. I have had at least twelve or fourteen houses burn down. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)

talks about what the people in Shea Heights did. Well, it is a common practice in Labrador, if anybody has their house burn down, everybody goes in and cuts the wood for the house. They do not ask Social Services for anything. They build the house for the people and they have been doing that in the past and they will continue to do it.

But all they are asking from this government is to treat people in the Province equally. With fire-fighting equipment, there is a mockery being made of it. They turn around and say, "Okay, Fox Harbour and St. Lewis, you cannot have it this year, but you are on the top of the list for next year." Then the next year comes and somehow or another they are down at the bottom of the list again and the only reason why they are down at the bottom of the list again is because Cabinet Ministers, backbenchers, as the Minister of Transportation said, 'It is easier to give something to a member of your own party because they in the daily conversation with you.' But what about the councils?

Why are we having councils and fire brigades that are volunteer if they are not being treated equally?

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are.

MR. HISCOCK:

I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, with the way this government operates that they would wish that all Liberals would burn to death, and all NDP people, so that we would have only Conservative people in this Province, and we would not have people like myself getting up and making speeches.

The proof is going to be in the pudding when this \$2 million is going to be announced. We will find out what the proof of the pudding is and we will find out that the majority of this \$2 million is going to go to Tory districts, just like the roads did and just like the water and sewerage and just like any other programmes. I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and to the Premier to defy me and to go and put some of this \$2 million into some NDP districts and Liberal districts, and treat our people equally. Our people are born equal. They have the right to strive and to improve their lot in life, but it is very, very hard in this Province to improve your lot in life if you happen to be a different stripe than this government.

The Minister of Housing made the statement that Liberals do not pay taxes. Well, the main reason why a lot of Liberals do not pay taxes in Liberal districts is because they are not given the opportunity of having improvements in fish plants and they are not given the opportunity to have industries attracted to them. The member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) has been saying for years, since he has been elected, "Upgrade the facilities at Harmon Corporation. It is all rotten and it is all falling apart." And what do they do? They again upgrade the Donovans Industrial Park and other areas in the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this programme, I do hope that this government has a remnant of compassion and that when the \$2 million is announced in the next couple of weeks, it will not be done on the basis of political patronage and it will not be done

on cold, callous facts where they take the position that we are going to have an election. Everybody says we are going to have an election, so therefore if you -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:  
In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will only say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), to all the ministers and to the Premier, start treating our people in this Province as equal citizens and give everybody in this Province some equal pride so that we can go on and build a better Province as we are elected here to do. Hopefully, some of these non-government seats will get some fire-fighting equipment or else it is a mockery.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
I do want to make a few comments on the budget.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Sit down.

MR. TULK:  
I will, eventually, and it will not be because I have been into the savory patch. I will sit down when I am good and ready or when my time is up, whichever is the case.

Mr. Speaker, under this heading, as I understand it, in this committee we have a concurrence debate on Finance, Public Works

and Services, Transportation, Consumer Affairs and Communications, Labour and Municipal Affairs. Mr. Speaker, as I was about to say on a point of order, we were berated yesterday when we opened this committee by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) because Opposition members and the press, well, that is a favorite tactic of the government these days as we saw the Premier today go completely out off his trees and going the press in the Province about information they should have which he refuses to release. That is a favorite tactic of the government. But in any case, we were berated by the member for Port au Port because the Opposition members and the press did not attend the committees diligently.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one, two, three, four, five, six, ministers that should obviously be here this evening to answer questions on their separate departments under this heading of Government Services. What do we have?

We have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I will say one thing for him -

DR. COLLINS:  
Only one thing!

MR. TULK:  
- the Premier tells us he has put this Province in a state of bankruptcy, that we have the highest public debt of any province in Canada, that it has risen \$3.5 billion, -

DR. COLLINS:  
Two things are enough.

MR. TULK:

- that he can not make a prediction as good as the weather forecaster in 1950 and we know what kind of a state that is, we know what kind of a state the weather forecasters are today but they were far worse in 1950 and the prediction of the Minister of Finance are about the same as the weather forecast in 1950 when it comes to predicting deficits. But at least the hon. gentleman has the courage to come in and sit in his seat and take questions, not only on behalf of his own department, but try, albeit, only in a half sort of way, but he has the courage to come in here at least and do it.

The Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) is now back in his seat or as we appropriately call him over here the Minister of Corporate Affairs, the man who refuses to take his responsibility and his department seriously, the man who would sooner deal in favour of the large corporations. So we only call him on this side, it has nothing to do with him personally but we only call him on this side half a minister. He looks after, in some small way, communications.

So what we have in the legislature, out of a total of six ministers, and six of the most important ministers in the Province when it comes to districts that are represented primarily on this side of the House and like the hon. gentleman for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) by and large represent, six of the most important ministers and we have one and a half ministers out of six.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this process that we are undergoing, the Estimates Committees and the

concurrence debates in the House have become ludicrous, have become practically a complete waste of time because what is the point of standing up and asking the Minister of Finance about the pork barreling and the ineffectual habits of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) in keeping labour peace in this Province? What is the point of standing up and asking the Minister of Finance why it was that the Minister of Labour, along with the Premier and the President of Treasury Board, the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), decided they were going to spend approximately \$250,000 to rub the noses of their own workers in the mud? What is the point of asking the Minister of Finance why he decided to do that? He is not a mind reader and if you ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), he does not know. So there is very little point, Mr. Speaker, in carrying on this kind of debate.

One is tempted to sit in the seat and see if there would be somebody on the government side of the House rise in this debate or rather should we not let it close because it is a total waste of time if you are not going to get answers. It is like beating your head against a stone wall. The press, which the Premier decided this morning he was going to take a strip off, going to frighten them, as he always tries to do with anybody in the Province, going to have them buckle under. He called the press conference this morning like the rooster, take them on, have a fight. It does not matter what happens after you have the fight, but have the fight. Put them in their place. He got on this morning and said, 'Report information that I do not give you.'

Now, the press today, if they are sitting in the gallery or up their in their room or wherever they sit around this place, we stand up and we ask questions; we put questions on Labour and we put questions on Finance, my friend for Twillingate has just finished putting questions on Municipal Affairs, and there is not a minister in his seat to answer the questions. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any point in doing this? Is there any point in getting into that?

For instance, the Minister of Labour - I suppose he is out in the common room somewhere - I saw him just now going around the corridors.

MR. DINN:  
He is out (inaudible).

MR. TULK:  
The Minister of Mines has just spoken again. He is not important, even when his committee is on. In this one he is not important at all. He could be out doing something, because in this committee he is not important anyway. The Minister of Education will try to answer any question that you ask him about his department, but if you asked him something about Labour or something about Consumer Affairs and Communications, the Minister of Education would only show up his ignorance even more, perhaps, than he does in some aspects of education.

There he is! He has been out sitting down all afternoon and he has the Workers' Compensation Board in the biggest mess that it has been in in a long time. That is what we want you to do, come to your seat and react, not react from the doorway. The hon. gentleman is new in this place.

He should react from his seat, not from the doorway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Workers' Compensation Board, since he is coming - wait until he gets in through the door. Is he coming in? Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
We now have two and a half ministers, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications - he tries to look after Communications.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask the Minister of Labour a question about the Workers' Compensation Board and see if he is going to get up and react to it.

MR. BAIRD:  
That is what we have Question Period for. Where were you today?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:  
We had Question Period about an hour and a half ago.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Old landslide Baird is at it again.

MR. BAIRD:  
That is when you should ask your questions.

MR. TULK:  
Old eighty-nine landslide Baird. Eighty-nine, was it not?

Workers' Compensation Board - let me put a situation to the minister

that has developed in this Province. Last year we passed a piece of legislation which the minister brought in -

MR. BLANCHARD:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Is this Question Period, or what is the hon. gentleman coming to?

MR. TULK:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman does not know very much.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I must rule there is no point of order.

MR. TULK:  
That is right. I know that the hon. member does not know very much. He does not know that the Department of Labour is under Government Services. He does not know that as the minister responsible he has to answer. Regardless of whether it is a question or statement, he is here to defend his estimates. He does not know that he has a duty to stand up here and tell us what the Workers' Compensation Board is going to pay to the patronage appointments of himself, of the government of which he is a part, and the government of Frank Moores. We know that he does not know very much, Mr. Speaker, but at least he should know that he

has to come into this Legislature and defend his actions in his department. Or does he believe now, as the Premier does, that you just say what he wants said without him passing out any information? Is that what he believes? Does he believe that we have to accept in this Province that his patronage appointments to the Workers' Compensation Board, and his government's, is going to cost this Province perhaps \$500,000, perhaps even more? Nobody knows, because that is another piece of information that he has failed to give out.

MR. BAIRD:

I think you must be a twin. One could not be that stunned.

MR. TULK:

He comes in the House one day and tells us that he has a settlement, and the next day we read in the newspapers, as we did, I think on the weekend - in The Sunday Express this weekend, I believe, there was another statement saying that a certain gentleman, I think a Mr. Woodford, is filing for a \$300,000 settlement. Some settlement!

MR. BAIRD:

You went to the meeting in Gander and reaffirmed your leader and then you stuck a knife in the man's back.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Old landslide is going at it. He thinks he is at a hockey game.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, what a shame! By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. BAIRD:

Good men died in Vietnam and the like of you is allowed to live.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I almost feels as if I am rising by the process of elimination. Anyway, I am glad to be back in the House.

MR. BAIRD:

It is nice to see you. What is your name?

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is nice to be back in the House. I would like to make a few comments. I do find it a little unusual, because of the weightiness and the seriousness of the debate we are into, that we do not see members from the other side rise to make comments and make points and let the people they are supposed to represent in this House know that they, in effect, are doing something. I think it was quite graphically pointed out just a few minutes ago, for example, whether it is true or not, that public perception is a big thing. The Opposition House Leader indicated that the Minister of Labour seems not to be aware of what is going on because he sat in his place and



asked, 'Can you ask a question during this particular procedure in the House?' He must know that.

MR. BLANCHARD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that I know very, very well what is going on. I just settled a dispute yesterday which he should be very well aware of. I noticed he did not give any points of praise about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

He probably did not know what was going on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Just as I suspected, Mr. Speaker. He is kind of easy. He gets up easy.

Whether he says he knows things or not, I guess I will take him at his word. He does indeed know some things. What he should know about his own department, though, I think is more critical than what he actually does know.

Having made that type of remark, I would just like to make a comment or two as it relates to municipal affairs.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible) thousand dollars, I guess.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I am sure the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains can relay it to him, or whoever wishes to relay it, that I find in Municipal Affairs, and I have been deeply involved with that aspect quite a number of years - I even had the pleasure during one term of office of having the member for Torngat Mountains a member of my town council, one of the probably thirty-some-odd good councillors I worked with. So he knows, of course, that I am quite familiar with municipal affairs.

It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain lack of planning, and I mean meaningful, long-range planning with respect to municipal affairs. I am not going to go into the pork barrelling question or anything like that at this point in time, because I think that is so blatantly obvious that there is no need to beat a dead horse. You will recall that when the minister was speaking in the House on this occasion, and other occasions, he said that the reason why such and such a community did not get some capital municipal funding this year was because they did not apply. Now, that might be quite correct, but it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that a mechanism could be put in place. The town of North West River wishes to complete the final phase of a water and sewerage project - I think there

are something like fifteen houses left in that community - and they, indeed, did not file a letter of request before the end of the last calendar year, which would be the proper procedure. It would strike me, and I am saying this for every community not just the Liberal represented communities or districts that have Conservative representation, that once they file a request to have certain municipal capital works put in place, it should not be necessary to refile each year except to, perhaps, update whatever they might have in the line of estimates as to cost or if they wish to withdraw their request. It strikes me that if in the 1980s communities in any district in this Province submitted requests for funding under municipal capital grants that those requests would remain valid as long as the need was there. Now, that, to me, would be a significant policy change that Municipal Affairs could put in place.

MR. BAIRD:  
(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:  
Yes, that is right, and would be placed on a prioritized list so that if, indeed, five years down the road from the initial application they may expect to get money, or one year down the road from the initial application they might expect to get money, that they would gradually move up the list until such time as they reached the top and would receive funding. With a policy in place such as that - and not every single council in our Province is totally knowledgeable on how the government will act or react to certain conditions - it would not be necessary for each council who has a requirement each year to

file yet another request, basically repeating the request they had done the year before, or several years previous. There should be a priority list established and once an application is made for funding to put some infrastructure in place, some municipal works in place, that would remain valid until such time as they reach the top of the priority list when, of course, they would receive their funding. The only need to reapply would be purely, as I have said already, to maybe update the figures on the cost estimates or to withdraw or make changes. But if it is still the same request, as it would be, for example, in Northwest River's case, in my district, that request should not have to be refiled each year by December 31.

MR. BAIRD:  
Will you be here again tomorrow?

MR. KELLAND:  
Just another minute or so, gentlemen. I know you are anxious to get out. Most of you were gone all day anyway, but that is okay.

MR. WARREN:  
How many are over there?

MR. KELLAND:  
Well, the obvious difference in both sides is where we have quality you guys purely have quantity. But thank you very much.

MR. BAIRD:  
You may have quality, but it is dam poor quality.

MR. KELLAND:  
Another thing that might be considered in municipal affairs, and I mean it purely as a constructive criticism, besides the priority list and the remaining active lists for

requests, that -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You make a good (inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:

We certainly need one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh! I had better wake up.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, we will call it 6:00 o'clock and I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow being Private Members' Day, I guess we will be into the next Private Member's Motion. I suppose if hon. members of the House wanted to change that they could; the House is in charge of its own rules. Of course you would have to have unanimous consent for that and, in the absence of any reaction from the three members opposite, I suppose we will go into the Private Member's Motion tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

What?

DR. COLLINS:

I was just saying that the House is in charge of its own rules and, unless there was unanimous consent to the contrary, we will go into the Private Member's Motion tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

Let me just, if I could?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

As a good, diligent House Leader, I will take that matter up with caucus at 10:00 o'clock in the morning and, unlike the government, we will make the decision as to what we want to do at that point, whether indeed will be prepared to give up - because NATO is not in any sense of a rush to get out of the House. Last week I think we just debated the motion for an hour or so and then let it go. But NATO to us, and the NDP's position on NATO, is a very important issue -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

- and we may not be prepared to say at that point that we are prepared to live with an hour's debate or a day's debate.

DR. COLLINS:

I guess if other certain members, who are now absent, take a different view they have every right to have their say in the House, which will take a certain period of time, and then there could be someone from this side have a say and someone from the Official Opposition, but that would not take up the full day and then we could go on to other matters. Anyway, that will be settled tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 o'clock.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.